Eusattus vs. Sphaeriontis

By Ira La Rivers, University of Nevada, Reno

In 1908, Col. T. L. Casey described the genus *Sphaeriontis* to include "five known species," which he arranged in a key: *S. muricata* (Le Conte) 1852, *S. dilatata* (Le Conte) 1852, *S. acomana* n. sp., *S. ciliata* (Horn) 1894 and *S. puberula* (Le Conte) 1854. He further emphasized that *S. dilitata* could not be considered a synonym of *S. muricata,* as Horn had indicated as early as his 1870 monograph on the family.

Having had occasion to go over *Eusattus* and *Sphaeriontis* somewhat completely in the recent past, it became rather obvious that the group as defined by Casey was more finely drawn than the actual specimens themselves warranted. My conclusions are that *Sphaeriontis* is a weak subgenus of *Eusattus,* and perfect intergradation between *Eusattus muricatus* and *E. dilatatus* in my series indicates that Horn was correct in synonymizing the latter with the former.

Casey makes mention of the "densely punctulate epipleurae and more or less confluent granules of the elytra" as "amply distinguishing it" (*dilatatus*) "from *muricata,* aside from its radically different habitat." The morphologic structures he calls attention to are those which Horn long ago fully demonstrated to be too weak and intergrading to be of value, and it is difficult to see why Casey resurrected them. As for their being "radically different" in habitat, my experience has shown that the two occur in identical situations, on sand dunes or in sanded areas; perhaps Casey's biologic information was based on second-hand data from others or gleaned from collecting one or a few anomalous individuals "out of character."

Another possible source of error may have been the fact that Casey based some of his conclusions as to relationships within the group solely on published descriptions not having seen, at the time of his paper, specimens of *E. dilatatus, E. puberulus* or *E. ciliatus.* In addition, the three species Casey added to the genus are quite patently synonyms of *Eusattus muricatus,* my conclusions being based on specimens from his type locality.

The synonymy should be indicated as

Eusattus Le Conte 1852
(*Sphaeriontis* Casey 1908)
  muricatus Le Conte 1852
    (*dilatatus* Le Conte 1852)
    (*acomana* Casey 1908)
    (*latissima* (Casey) 1924)
    (*fulvescens* (Casey) 1924)
  ciliatus Horn 1894
  puberulus Le Conte 1854

I have previously made passing mention of *Sphaeriontis* as a subgenus of *Eusattus* (1948: 709).

Works Cited

Casey, T. L. 1908. A revision of the tenebrionid subfamily Coniontiae. Proc. Wash. Acad. Sci., 10: 51–166.

Horn, G. H. 1870. Revision of the Tenebrionidae of America north of Mexico. Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc., 14 (n.s.) : 253–404.

La Rivers, I. 1948. A synopsis of Nevada Orthoptera. Amer. Midl. Nat., 39: 652–720.

Records of the Order Zoraptera from Alabama

By B. D. Valentine and E. O. Wilson, University of Alabama

A B. Guerney (*Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash.,* 40: 3, 1938), in his synopsis of the order Zoraptera, estimated the range of *Zorotypus hubbardi* Caudell to be from Maryland to Texas. Although he included no records from Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, Guerney stated that the insect is probably abundant in all of the southern states. Recent collections from Alabama have been numerous enough to indicate that this is true at least in this state. Typical *Z. hubbardi* was collected from March 30 through April 28, 1949, in the following widely distributed localities: Millport, Lamar Co.; Gordo, Pickens Co.; Alberta City, Peterson, and Lynn Haven, Tuscaloosa Co.; Eutaw, Greene Co.; Alabama Port, Mobile Co.; Bear Point, near Orange Beach, Baldwin Co.; and Chattahoochee State Park, Houston